

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAY 24 2006

Doc Code: AP.PRE.REQ

PTO/SB/33 (07-05)

Approved for use through xx/xx/200x. OMB 0651-00xx
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW		Docket Number (Optional) VIXS.0100090 (1459-0100090)	
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to "Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450" [37 CFR 1.8(a)] on <u>May 24, 2006</u> Signature <u>Jennifer Jensen</u> Typed or printed name <u>Jennifer Jensen</u>		Application Number 09/918,380 First Named Inventor Indra LAKSONO Art Unit 2613	Filed July 30, 2001 Examiner Nhon Thanh DIEP
Applicant requests review of the final rejection in the above-identified application. No amendments are being filed with this request. This request is being filed with a notice of appeal. The review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the attached sheet(s). Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provided.			
I am the <input type="checkbox"/> applicant/inventor. <input type="checkbox"/> assignee of record of the entire interest. See 37 CFR 3.71. Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) is enclosed. (Form PTO/SB/96) <input type="checkbox"/> attorney or agent of record. Registration number _____ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> attorney or agent acting under 37 CFR 1.34. Registration number if acting under 37 CFR 1.34 <u>51,596</u>		Signature <u>Ryan S. Davidson</u> Typed or printed name <u>512-439-7100</u> Telephone number <u>24 May 2006</u> Date	
NOTE: Signatures of all the inventors or assignees of record of the entire interest or their representative(s) are required. Submit multiple forms if more than one signature is required, see below*.			
<input type="checkbox"/> *Total of _____ forms are submitted.			

This collection of information is required by 35 U.S.C. 132. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11, 1.14 and 41.6. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

MAY 24 2006

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicants: Indra LAKSONO et al.
Title: SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR MULTIPLE CHANNEL VIDEO
TRANSCODING
App. No.: 09/918,380 Filed: 07/30/2001
Examiner: DIEP, Nhon Thanh Group Art Unit: 2613
Customer No.: 29331 Confirmation No.: 9961
Atty. Dkt. No.: VIXS.0100090
(1459-0100090)

Mail Stop AF
Commissioner for Patents
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**REMARKS IN SUPPORT OF
THE PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW**

Dear Sir:

In response to the Final Office Action mailed January 24, 2006 (hereinafter, "the Final Action") and pursuant to the Notice of Appeal and Pre-Appeal Brief Request for Review submitted herewith, the Applicants request review of the following issues on appeal.

Request for at least a third Examiner on the Panel

In order to facilitate full consideration of the remarks filed herewith, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Art Unit Supervisor designate a panel including at least a third Examiner in addition to the Examiner of record and a Supervisor.

PATENT

Wang fails to disclose a first processor to provide parsed video data and a second processor to access the parsed video data, the second processor including a video transcoder as recited by claim 13

Under 35 U.S.C. § 102, the Patent Office bears the burden of presenting at least a prima facie case of anticipation. *In re Sun*, 31 USPQ2d 1451, 1453 (Fed. Cir. 1993) (unpublished). Anticipation requires that a prior art reference disclose, either expressly or under the principles of inherency, each and every element of the claimed invention. *Id.*


Independent claim 13 recites the features of “a first processor to receive digital video data and to provide parsed video data” and “a second processor coupled to the first processor to access the parsed video data, the second processor including a video transcoder.” As noted at page 11 of the Response to Non-Final Action mailed October 20, 2005 (hereinafter, the “Response”), the Non-Final Action fails to address these specific features. The Final Action responds by asserting that the transcoder of FIG. 3 of Wang “is adequate to show a first processor to analyze (el. 410, VLD analyzes header information of input . . . and separates MV from other data) video data and a second processor (el. 420-430-440-22-225-...) access[es] the parsed video data and is a transcoder.” *Final Action*, p. 2. However, it is respectfully submitted that the Office’s interpretation of the transcoder of FIG. 3 as two separate processors is suggested solely by the present application. To illustrate, the passage of Wang associated with FIG. 3 is found at col. 7, lines 40-56. Nowhere in this passage does Wang expressly disclose that the transcoder of FIG. 3 is implemented as two or more processors or that any of the decoder, encoder or transcoder is implemented as a separate processor from the other components. Moreover, no other passage of Wang discloses that a transcoder is or can be implemented as two or more separate processors. It further is submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art will recognize that transcoders typically are implemented as a single processing device. Accordingly, as Wang fails to disclose, or even suggest, a first processor that parses video data and a second processor that includes a transcoder and that accesses the parsed video data, Wang necessarily fails to disclose at least the claimed features of “a first processor to receive digital video data and to provide parsed video data” and “a second processor coupled to the first processor to access the parsed video data, the second processor including a video transcoder” as recited by claim 13.

PATENT

Conclusion

As discussed above, the Final Action fails to establish that the proposed combinations of the cited references disclose or suggest each and every element recited by any of the pending claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Ryan S. Davidson, Reg. No. 51,596

LARSON NEWMAN ABEL POLANSKY & WHITE, LLP

5914 West Courtyard Dr., Suite 200

Austin, Texas 78730

(512) 439-7100 (phone) (512) 439-7199 (fax)

24 May 2006
Date